and display the second-eye image. In other words, with goggles, there is no need to alternate or blend the images electronically since the user's visual perception will naturally perform all required processes to perceive depth in the two separate images. This is possible only with goggles because two separate display devices are used; one for each eye.

When using the color filtering display method, it is not possible for the first-eye image to be displayed independently of the loop that is used to capture and display the second-eye image. That is because a single display device is being used to display two images, requiring that the two images be blended. Thus, the loop which is used to capture and display the second-eye image must be used to simultaneously display the first-eye image on the same display.

Ultimately, if I omit claim 8, another person could create a device which uses goggles to display the images. This device could capture one image, display it constantly to the user's first eye, and then capture a second moving image and display it to the user's second eye. They could do this without infringing upon my patent due to the fact that their device would use a different process than that which I have described in claim 2 or 4.

The shutter glass display method, which is supported by claim 4, cannot use the processes which are set forth in claims 2 and 8. That is because the shutter glass method requires the two images to be alternated very rapidly on the same display. The images cannot be displayed simultaneously as claim 2 states for methods such as color filtering. The images also cannot be displayed independently as claim 8 states for methods such as virtual reality goggles.

In claims 2 and 4, the word "simultaneously" and the phrase "in an alternating fashion" were needed to accurately specify the manner in which the images are displayed. If those key items are left out so that claims 2 and 4 can be condensed into one claim, it is possible that the lack of accuracy may be misconstrued to mean that the images are simply displayed simultaneously. I believe that this would not be acceptable for covering the shutter glass method.

I agree that it is obvious to use a plurality of different display types. That, however, should not be reason to omit claims for the different processes used by specific display methods. I believe I must maintain those claims; even if only for display efficiency reasons.

Thus, I stand firmly by my belief that claims 1, 2, 4 and 8 are necessary to maintain the scope and spirit of my claimed invention.

Request for assistance with change of name

In order to change my name, I was instructed that I must submit a petition under 37 CFR 1.182. The form that most closely matches that is sb0017p.pdf (located at http://www.uspto.gov/web/forms/sb0017p.pdf). According to that form, I will need to incur a $400 fee for filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.182. This seems unfair as it is only a name change to an application rather than a full patent. It is also unfair that small entity fees are not available, thus I am forced to pay the full fee. I cannot be certain that a patent will be granted, and so paying $400 to have the name changed on the application seems like too big of a gamble.